



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,498	03/25/2004	Lin Wang	06401.00418	9050
22908	7590	08/08/2006		EXAMINER
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. TEN SOUTH WACKER DRIVE SUITE 3000 CHICAGO, IL 60606			HUSON, MONICA ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/687,498	WANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Monica A. Huson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2003.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>040604</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakatsuka et al. (U.S. Patent 4,076,846), in view of Redding, Jr. (U.S. Patent 5,455,342), further in view of Altieri (U.S. Patent 5,849,233). Regarding Claim 1, Nakatsuka et al., hereafter "Nakatsuka," show that it is known to carry out a method for preparing a film (Abstract), the process comprising providing a hydroxyalkyl starch, said starch being derivatized with a hydroxyalkyl substituent having from 2 to 6 carbon atoms (Column 6, lines 60-62); and extruding said starch in an extruder, said extruder having a barrel, a die, and at least one rotating shaft, said barrel having at least first and second zones, said first zone being upstream from said second zone, the temperature in the first zone being insufficient to gelatinize said starch and the temperature in said second zone being sufficient to gelatinize said starch, said starch being extruded in the presence of controlled moisture, said process including the step of controlling the rotational speed of said shaft to impart specific mechanical energy to said starch sufficient to result in a soluble extruded starch product that is capable of extrusion through said die at said rotational speed (Column 8, lines 9-17, 31-33, 49-53; Column 13, lines 31-40; Column 14, lines 5-12, 25-28; It is noted that gelatinization occurs about 150C-175C.), said solution having been prepared by mixing said starch product with water (Column 12, lines 20-

24); and forming a film from said solution (Column 4, lines 5-13). Nakatsuka does not specifically disclose the particle size of his common starch. Redding, Jr. shows that it is known to carry out a method of molding starches wherein the starches have a particle size distribution such that at least 90% by weight of the starch particles pass through an 80 mesh (180 micron) screen (Column 1, lines 19-23; It is being interpreted that since starch is "commonly found" at sizes from 5-25 microns, at least 90% by weight of starch would fall into the disclosed size of 5-25 microns.). Redding, Jr. and Nakatsuka are combinable because they are concerned with a similar technical field, namely, methods of molding starches. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the size disclosed in Redding, Jr. as that of Nakatsuka's "common" starches in order to design molding processes that would accommodate specifically-sized granules. Nakatsuka does not specifically show barrel moisture levels. Altieri shows that it is known to carry out a method wherein the moisture in the barrel does not exceed 25% by weight of said starch (Column 1, lines 56-58). Altieri and Nakatsuka are combinable because they are concerned with a similar technical field, namely, methods of molding starches. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Altieri's specific barrel moisture teachings during Nakatsuka's molding process in order to most accurately form a product that accommodates exclusive end-use specifications.

Regarding Claim 2, Nakatsuka shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, but he does not give barrel moisture levels. Altieri shows that it is known to carry out a method wherein the moisture in the barrel does not exceed 25% by weight of said starch (Column 1, lines 56-58). It is noted that a prior art reference that discloses a range encompassing a somewhat narrower claimed range is

sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP 2144.05; *In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1330, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir.2003). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate Nakatsuka's molding method under a somewhat narrower moisture range of less than 22.5% by weight of the starch, suggested by Altieri, in order to most accurately form a product that accommodates exclusive end-use specifications.

Regarding Claim 3, Nakatsuka shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, but he does not give barrel moisture levels. Altieri shows that it is known to carry out a method wherein the moisture in the barrel does not exceed 25% by weight of said starch (Column 1, lines 56-58). It is noted that a prior art reference that discloses a range encompassing a somewhat narrower claimed range is sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP 2144.05; *In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1330, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir.2003). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate Nakatsuka's molding method under a somewhat narrower moisture range of less than 20% by weight of the starch, suggested by Altieri, in order to most accurately form a product that accommodates exclusive end-use specifications.

Regarding Claim 4, Nakatsuka shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, but he does not give barrel moisture levels. Altieri shows that it is known to carry out a method wherein the moisture in the barrel does not exceed 25% by weight of said starch (Column 1, lines 56-58). It is noted that a prior art reference that discloses a range encompassing a somewhat narrower claimed range is sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP 2144.05; *In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1330, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382-83 (Fed.

Art Unit: 1732

Cir.2003). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate Nakatsuka's molding method under a somewhat narrower moisture range of less than 17.5% by weight of the starch, suggested by Altieri, in order to most accurately form a product that accommodates exclusive end-use specifications.

Regarding Claim 5, Nakatsuka shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, including a method wherein the solution includes a plasticizer (Abstract), meeting applicant's claim.

Regarding Claim 6, Nakatsuka shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, including a film formed by the said process (Column 4, lines 5-13), meeting applicant's claim.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica A. Huson whose telephone number is 571-272-1198. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:45am-3:15pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Monica A Huson

August 7, 2006